



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

authorized usage, as in the plural of the adjective *fatals* (masc.). Littré admits no plural whatever and the best authorities agree with him. *Fatals* is, to be sure, gaining ground and will no doubt one day obtain. I see no benefit to be derived by conforming to the French rule of prefixing the conjunction *que* to the inflection of the subjunctive tenses, nor in making the preposition *to* the "sign of the infinitive." Such obsolete usages and terms might advantageously be dispensed with, as they are really misleading and help to form wrong impressions which it is almost impossible to correct.

The remarks on the formation of the different parts of the verb (p. 85 ff.) are highly to be commended and will serve to lighten its study very much. This and the chapters on the irregular verbs, on the conjunctive and disjunctive pronouns, on the use of *ce* and *il* with *être*, are extremely clear and excellent. Yet I would recommend the study of *ce* and *il* in Sauveur's 'Grammaire Française pour les Anglais' to every teacher, where the subject has received an exhaustive discussion. The delicate points of *que* as predicate receive due attention on p. 122. Whether *je sache* is subjunctive or indicative is one of those disputed points that will never be settled (cf. Am. Journ. of Philol., Vol. I., p. 197).

In the Second Part, the opening chapter shows the relation of the French to the Latin, and this feature is made more prominent throughout the rest of the book. It is intended for more advanced pupils and will form an excellent introduction to the comparative study of the French. The treatment of the subjunctive is thorough and complete, and the examples from the best authors given at the end of each special head serve as models to the English exercises for translation into French.

It would not be a difficult task to find fault with many things in the book, but I have only attempted to call attention to its excellencies and point out in what respect it might have been improved. Naturally one who pays more attention to matter than to the manner in which he presents it will occasionally use expressions that a second reading would have improved. One of these cases we find in the expression "there is had in view." We can,

however, more willingly excuse these defects than erroneous statement.

In conclusion we heartily recommend this new book to all colleagues as a vast improvement on the ordinary school text-book.

SYLVESTER PRIMER.

College of Charleston.

### ENGLISH METRE.

*Chapters on English Metre*, by JOSEPH B. MAYOR, M.A. London, C. J. Clay & Sons, 1886. viii, 206 pp. 8vo.

An assembly of classical and high-school teachers happened the other day to fall into a discussion about the study of English versification. The sentiment prevailed that with classes in English literature poetry should be read for the sense rather than for the metre. One gentleman waxed bolder. What was the use of poetry, anyhow? Nothing, he assured us, had ever been said in poetry that could not be better said in prose. Now, even a body of schoolmasters feels a little shy when it comes to wiping poetry off the face of the globe, and I am bound to say that the speaker did not carry his audience with him. But such utterances are depressing in many ways. Doubly pleasant is it, therefore, to take up this book of Mayor's, and find an Englishman, a university scholar, a friend and aid to those who would live in the classics, deliberately advocating for schools the study and analysis of English metres. Moreover, he writes this text-book to help the cause. He takes his subject seriously. Your classical man, approaching the vernacular, too often assumes a patronizing and off-duty air, sees all things in Greek, and looks over his spectacles at a bit of native verse with—"Not a bad little choriambic, that!" Such a writer is pretty sure to ignore the work of Germanists. Schipper, in his *Metrik*, has a fair and exhaustive introduction on the factors of English verse; quantity (Kap. V.) fares better than one could reasonably ask. It is therefore surprising to find Dr. Goodell (Trans. Amer. Philol. Assoc., 1885) writing on the very foundation of our metres and saying not a word of Schipper, of Rieger, of Scherer, and the rest. Aside from his extravagant claims for quantity (well answered

by Prof. W. D. Whitney, *Proceed.* p. vii.), Dr. Goodell will have very serious difficulties in persuading scholars to accept his scanning of "willow" or "mallow" (in Tennyson's *Brook*) with a 'short' (eighth note) for the first or root syllable, and a 'long' (quarter) for the second syllable, (cf. *Trans.*, p. 85), a proceeding directly defiant of the fundamental law of Germanic verse.

Not so with our author. He recognizes the dignity of English metres as an independent science. I think, however, that he makes a mistake when (p. 3 f.) he sunders the scientific from the historical treatment. Our modern verse is the result of slow development, and is a compromise between Germanic and Romance (cf. ten Brink, *Chaucer's S. und V.*, p. 5). For scientific purposes one must judge any verse of to-day in the double light of its rhythmic and its metric (the terms are easily understood); and to this end one needs often the historic treatment and always the historic sense. This I regard as the main error of Mayor's book,—a criticism which may perhaps be clear from the following considerations.

The author takes "scanning by feet" (p. 7) as the basis of metrical study. Guest's 'sections' are ruled out of court. Dr. Abbott is criticised as too stiff and mechanical in his arrangement of feet (Chap. iii.). J. A. Symonds and his "æsthetic intuitivism" are found wanting in precision and practical value (Chap. iv.). Ellis is lightly criticised; and then the author (vi., vii.) gives his own views. He is more conservative than Ellis, for whom, however, he shows great respect; less stiff than Abbott; far more precise than Symonds. Mayor's chief work is to determine the exact feet of a given verse. To this end he collects and analyzes an admirable array of specimen lines from various poets, principally Shakespeare, Tennyson and Browning. The foot being the unit of metre, we must divide properly every line we meet. When Dr. Abbott treats (cf. p. 45)

To lack | discret | ion. Come, go | we to | the king |  
as a case of "extra-metrical syllable" before the pause, this, says Mayor, is a mistake. We must regard the third foot as an anapaest. Again (p. 94), Prof. Bain assumes amphibrach in

There came to | the shore a | poor exile | of Erin. |

Not so, says Mayor; these be anapaests:

There came | to the shore | a poor ex | ile of Er | in.

Again (p. 36), our author rightly condemns Abbott's scanning:

Your breath | first kindled | the de | ad coal | of war. |

Now, looking for ourselves at these three verses, we are struck, in regard to the first two, by the fact that it makes no difference whatever to the real rhythm of the line whether we take Abbott's and Bain's, or Mayor's point of view. The *movement* remains the same. Not so, of course, with the third. We condemn the division of "de-ad;" but we need not, with Mayor, query about the feet. Using Ellis' scheme of notation, we "scan:"

Your breath first kindled || the dead coal of war,  
1 2 1 2 0 || 0 2 2 0 2

and we quite plainly get the movement and the effect of the measures, though the third measure has no weight at all: the principle of distribution and compensation<sup>1</sup> must solve the problem, along with the allowance for pauses, and for hovering accent ("*schwebende Betonung*"). The latter term is far better than "spondee," which Mayor so often uses. We have no spondees in English. Whenever a clash occurs between word-accent and verse-accent, as in

The rude *forefathers* of the hamlet sleep,

we have hovering accent, a division of honors, but not a strict spondee. It seems to me that hovering accent nearly always calls out an alteration of *pitch*, as a sort of reconciliation for conflicting claims. Certainly wrong is "trochee" as name for the last foot in (Jason)

About this keel that you are now lacking,

which is a clear case of "wrenched accent," (Mayor, p. 83). Division into feet will never reveal all the secrets of rhythm. Nor does Mayor pay enough attention to the Pause. A good example is on p. 131, when he scans

Holy, | Holy, | Holy, | Lo-rd | God Al | mighty |  
Early | in the | morning | oûr | song shall | rise to | thee—

counting *Lord, our*, as dissyllabic. This will not do. The harmony of a verse depends not simply on a succession of equal measures, but on the mutual dependence and adjustments of these measures. Rhythm, we must never for-

<sup>1</sup> Sievers admits (*Beiträge*, x. 221) the frequent inequality, in time-relations, of our primitive measures; we have clung to this license.

get, means *movement*. Therefore, issue must be taken with Mayor on this point: not the foot, but the verse, the continuous verse, should be assumed as metrical unit.

This assumption of the verse as unit—which does not imply rejection of the measure or foot as a factor in metre—is necessary for one who would get at the rhythm of poetry. "Mit den Strichen für Länge und den Haken für Kürze," says Schmidt in different application, "ist aber doch wahrlich kein Rhythmus gefunden, und ohne Rhythmus keine Poesie!" One feels that the demands of Symonds for a more elastic treatment of metre have their good reasons. Add the artificial and fortuitous character of much of this "scanning by feet." Our author frankly tells us that in order to determine what feet compose a verse, one must often run over half-a-dozen lines, catch the prevailing measure, and then apply it verse by verse. This breaks down in lyric poetry. Despite his lore about the monosyllabic initial foot, Mayor confesses that often one metre is just as applicable as another. The decision is an appeal to the majority of verses. Take Tennyson's 'Lucknow' (p. 116). What is its metre? The ordinary reader answers, a spirited six-stress verse in prevailing triple measures. But we must know the feet. There are verses like

Bullets would | sing by our | foreheads  
and | bullets would | rain at our | feet  $\wedge \wedge$

and

$\wedge \wedge$  Mine? | yes a mine, | Countermine, | Down,  
down, | and creep | through the hole | .

The first, says Mayor, "naturally" and "taken separately" would read as dactylic; the second as anapaestic; but since we *cannot* scan the second as dactylic, and *could* scan the first as anapaestic, it is best to call both anapaestic (117). This seems a sort of *reductio ad absurdum*. Keats' well known line:

Thea! Thea! Thea! Where is Saturn?

must, I suppose, be scanned:

The | a The | a The | a Where is Sat | urn?!

Why not, however, call it a bit of melodious daring, a discord which makes harmony, a "trochaic" verse, if one will, finely breaking the iambic flow? What difference, after all, whether one reads with Mayor:

$\wedge$  Sud | denly from | him breaks | his wife,

or,

Suddenly | from him | breaks his | wife  $\wedge$ ?

Let us now take a case where historic treatment could correct the superficial results of scanning by feet. The author is treating the "four-foot iambic," He mentions as an example Tennyson's 'Arabian Nights.' Then he goes on to say that Scott's 'Lay of the Last Minstrel' and Coleridge's 'Christabel' are in the same metre "with frequent anapaestic substitution." In one sense, this is true. But when we classify metre, we must go beyond mere feet. We must get at the movement of the verse in its whole scope, following it all through the poem. In a loose way, Scott's poem and 'Christabel' may be put in the same class. May we do the same with Tennyson's? And is it right to speak of "anapaestic substitution?" To take Tennyson's first, we find, apart from the two opening verses of the prelude, nothing whatever of the free movement so common in 'Christabel.' It is the regular so-called octosyllabic verse. Though doubtless whole passages could be found in 'Christabel' to match passages in the 'Arabian Nights, we can be quite sure that at heart these two metres are absolutely different. They go back to the two groups of four-stress verse which Schipper denotes as *viertaktig* and *vierhabig*, (cf. Metr. 78 ff.). One, the Romance tendency, cleaves to regular double measures; the other, of Germanic origin, frequently breaks into triple measure. Even in modern times, it is not hypercritical to insist on the distinction, little as the distinction may affect ordinary metres. To call the verse of 'Christabel' iambic with anapaestic substitution, is to assert the direct opposite of the true process. Triple measure is a slowly disappearing factor, not an intruder. Coleridge's supposed "new" metre is found in a host of earlier poems; let us instance the February, May and September eclogues of Spenser's 'Shepherd's Calender,' but with this difference: in the 'Shepherd's Calender,' say 'February,' out of two hundred and forty-six verses, all but a dozen show triple measure (cf. *Amer. Jl. Philol.*, vii. 63); in 'Christabel,' Part I., out of two hundred and seventy verses (eight "defective" not counted) there are fifty-three with genuine triple measure, eleven with triple effect, and two hundred and six without triple measure. Over 20% of 'Christabel,' (Part I.) then, is in the genuine old movement,

and this is enough to color the whole poem. The similarity of movement is evident:

SHEPHEARD'S CALENDER.

Yet never complained of cold nor heate.

CHRISTABEL.

She folded her hands beneath her cloak,  
And stole to the other side of the oak.

SHEPHEARD'S CALENDER.

From good to badd, and from badde to worse.

CHRISTABEL.

The moon shines dim in the open air.

For alliteration, recalling the real origin of this metre in Anglo-Saxon verse, cf. ('Christabel')

Now in glimmer and now in gloom.

Of course, no one can be blamed for a slip or two. Not much importance is to be attached to the inconsistency, when Mayor quotes as example of "initial truncation" of regular iambic verse:

I wish | I were | where Hel | en lies,  
Night | and day | on me | she cries;

and, on p. 130, speaks of the verses:

We close the weary eye,  
Saviour ever near,

as "mixed iambic and trochaic," when the case is the same (initial truncation) as above. But in the case of the chapter on Surrey and Marlowe, there is neglect of some very plain historic considerations which the author could hardly have neglected if he had read Schröer's essay in the *Anglia*, 'Ueber die Anfänge des Blankverses in England,' which shows how much is due to the principle of syllable-counting. Scanning by modern rules leads to such a notation as this (p. 137):

The	fell		Ajax		and	ef		ther	A		trides.
o	i		2 o		o	i		o	o		i o

To sum up: our author's treatment of verse is not so much incorrect as incomplete. The scheme, or metrical basis, is well handled; we miss a good account of rhythm and the individuality of verse. Our English measures, or feet, far more than the classic, derive their meaning and influence less from themselves than from their relations as coherent parts. A verse is a harmonious sum of relations of continuous measures, not simply a sequence of harmonious similar measures. As Ellis and Sylvester have pointed out, a rhythmic connexion can run through a whole series of verses. Hence we take a verse as unit, analyze it for its scheme, its ground-plan, or combine it with

other verses to form a rhythmic group—like the stanza. Bare scanning by feet is not enough. "Metric," says Sylvester, "guards the ear, Synectic satisfies, Chromatic (tone-color, etc.) charms it." To stop at "feet," is to obtain the metric skeleton, but to forego the curves and color of the flesh, the grace of posture, the delight of motion.

FRANCIS B. GUMMERE.

*New Bedford.*

*Dialogues français* par JOH. STORM. Copenhagen (Gyldendalske Boghandel, 1887).

This collection of French dialogues deserves especial attention as being a new protest against the old method of teaching modern languages, by a philologist of high reputation in the learned world, Professor Storm of the University of Christiania. Naturally enough, every distinguished name that is added to the aggressive school gives it renewed strength, and it is therefore of some interest to see what principles exactly are advocated by the new adherent.

It might almost have been expected that a scholar like Storm, even when advocating a practical study of the modern languages, would not take his position among the extreme reformers, of whom many sacrifice critical method and thoughtful effort to easy-going imitation. Storm, indeed, insists that modern languages should be learned more by imitation than by rules, but he would build, however, on the solid basis of a methodical grammar, only that this grammar should include not a mass of bewildering details, but simply the leading features of the language, its paradigms and a few short and clear rules. And by his empirical method he does not mean that the pupil should be taken through a heavy volume of disconnected grammatical rules, mingled in the Ollendorff manner helter-skelter with childish exercises of all kinds of possible and impossible combinations. He means that he should early be put to reading easy prose, especially such as reflects most truly the unaffected style of common life, and be held to imitate its style, and, farther, that his reading should be accompanied by a systematical study of ordinary idiomatic phraseology.